

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,179	01/14/2004	Ming Chen	7784-000686	4185
27572	7590 12/12/2005		EXAMINER	
HARNES	S, DICKEY & PIERCE,	CAO, HUEDUNG X		
P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BLOOMFI	ELD HILLS, MI 48303		2821	TALER NOWIDER
			DATE MAII ED: 12/12/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/757,179	CHEN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Huedung X. Cao	2821			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Se	eptember 2005.				
• •	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)	· · · · ·					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) Claim(s) 1-7,9-24,36 and 38 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7,9-24,36 and 38 is/are rejected. 					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 January 2004</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
	ee of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔲 Infor	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2821

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1, 9, 12, 16, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 9, 12, 16, 36, and 38 have been amended to recited "the dielectric member having a base portion having a diameter about equal to an opening in the tubular waveguide component in which the base portion is inserted" which does not appear to be in the originally filed specification. Thus, the recitation must be treated as "new matter". However, if the applicant does not believe that this subject matter is "new matter", an appropriate explanation is required including pointing out where support for this subject matter can be found in the origin specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2821

3. Claim 1-3, 5-7, 9-24, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BURGER et al. (US 6353418 B1) in view of HOLAK et al. (US 5175555).

As per claim 1, Burger teaches the claimed "a waveguide for use with an antenna aperture for forming a transition region for channeling electromagnetic wave signals, the waveguide" (Burger, figure 2, waveguide 13 for use with antenna 9) comprising:

a dielectric member having a predetermined length and a generally conical profile, and inserted at least substantially into the tubular waveguide component to be at least substantially housed therein and wherein at least one of said dielectric member and said tapering inner surface comprises a surface that is non-linear (Burger, figure 2, dielectric member 31, column 3, lines 37-56);

a tubular waveguide component (Burger, figure 2, waveguide 13) having a tapering inner surface which Burger does not explicitly disclose. However, Holak teaches that such waveguide having a tapering inner surface is widely used in the art (Holak, figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Burger a tubular waveguide with a tapering inner surface, as taught by Holak by doing so it would improve the resultant radiation pattern.

Claim 2 adds into claim 1, wherein the dielectric member is comprised of a plurality of linear sections forming said generally conical profile (Burger, figure 2, dielectric 31).

Art Unit: 2821

Claim 3 adds into claim 1, wherein the tapering inner surface comprises a plurality of adjacently formed linear surface sections inner surface sections (Burger, figure 2, waveguide 13 with plurality of linear surface sections).

Claim 5 adds into claim 1, wherein the tapering inner surface of the tubular waveguide component comprises a gradually curving inner surface (Holak, figure 2).

Claim 6 adds into claim 1, wherein the dielectric member is disposed concentrically within said tubular waveguide component (Burger, figure 2, dielectric 31 is disposed in the tabular waveguide).

Claim 7 adds into claim 1, wherein said dielectric member has a non-linear outer surface and said tubular waveguide component has a non-linear inner surface (Burger, figure 2, dielectric 31).

Claims 9-11 are similar in scope to claims 1-3, and 6-8; therefore; they are rejected for the same reason.

Claims 12-15 are similar in scope to claims 1-3, and 6-8; therefore; they are rejected for the same reason.

Claims 16-24 are similar in scope to claims 1-3, and 6-8; therefore; they are rejected for the same reason.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 1 except for the step of having plurality of waveguides for use in the array antenna. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to build the phased array antenna system with the duplicated waveguides.

Art Unit: 2821

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BURGER et al. (US 6353418 B1) in view of CHIRON et al. (US 3765021).

As per claim 4, wherein the generally conical profile of said dielectric member comprises a gradually curving surface which Burger does not explicitly disclose.

However, Chiron teaches that such conical profile of the dielectric member with a gradually curving surface is widely used in the art (Chiron, figure 1, dielectric structure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Burger a tubular waveguide with a tapering inner surface, as taught by Holak by doing so it would improve the resultant radiation pattern.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by BURGER et al. (US 6353418 B1).

As per claim 38, Burger teaches the claimed, a "waveguide for an antenna system" comprising: means for defining a cut-off frequency threshold of the waveguide by controlling a geometry of a tubular waveguide component relative to a dielectric insert disposed within the tubular waveguide component (Burger, column 6, lines 6-28).

Art Unit: 2821

Conclusion

Page 6

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2821

Inquiries

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Huedung Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1939.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Don Wong, can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Huedung Cao

Patent Examiner

Primary Examiner

Page 7